

REMARKS

Claims 29-47 are pending in the application; Claims 29-37 and 39-47 are rejected; Claim 38 is objected to. By this Amendment, Claim 30 has been amended. These amendments add no new matter to the application.

The abstract has now been amended to be 150 words or less. In addition, the specification has been objected to because of various informalities (typographic and grammatical errors). Four of these errors have been corrected by amendment of the relevant specification paragraphs. As regards the remaining two errors, that "on page 19, line 3, 'Pr cesses' should be 'Processes'", and that "on page 29, line 20, there is an extra period at the end of a sentence", these errors could not be found in the application as published by the USPTO on February 10, 2005. Acceptance of the Abstract and Specification as amended is therefore respectfully requested. Claim 30 is objected to because of the informality of the phrase, "at least one criteria." The claim has been appropriately amended to read, "at least one criterion," and early favorable action is requested.

Claims 29, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as allegedly unpatentable over the article "Going to the Chapel" by Cohen in view of official notice; Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The Examiner admits that Cohen does not expressly disclose element (a) of base Claim 29, "running a gift registrar application on at least one gift registry site". The Examiner then asserts an unsupported 'official notice' that "running applications on computers is well known." But there is no suggestion in Cohen that his "gift registry" or "bridal registry" is anything more than a displayed table; not the gift registrar application as disclosed by Applicant. The mere stating of a function does not serve as a teaching of how that function might be implemented. A person can drive to the store and purchase milk; a person can also rig a weight sensor to determine that milk is needed and activate a computer program which will send notification to the grocery store, along with

payment and have the milk automatically delivered. Both result in receiving milk, but merely stating, "A person purchases milk," does not teach the second system. It does not appear from any of the Examiner's citations that a gift registrar application was indeed common in 1999, and Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and allow the claim.

Further, Cohen does not disclose element (b), "a gift registrant accessing goods or services online from a plurality of SP sites..." Cohen discusses a "retail shopping service" and an "online retail catalog". This actually teaches away from the gift registrant accessing goods or services directly from a Service Provider site. There is no suggestion that these websites were more than a catalog or online store which merely purchased and resold items for profit. As summarized in Applicant's application, "The present invention provides a system and method in which Service Providers host their own content as directly-accessible sites (referred to herein as "SP sites") on a distributed network such as the Internet, while relying on a centralized Gift Registry site (which implements an Online Gift Registry Service) to handle the registration of individual "Wish" lists. The claimed system advantageously allows users to register items from the SP sites while shopping, without having to access the centralized Gift Registry site directly." (Application, Page 2, Paragraph 6).

Cohen teaches away from element (b). TheWeddingChannel site teaches, "Brides and Bridegrooms choose from thousands of products in the site's virtual storefront.[Emphasis added]" (Cohen, Paragraph 2). The Wedding Network teaches that guests purchase gifts, "from the Web site.[www.weddingnetwork.com]"(Cohen, Paragraph 3). The American Bridal Registry teaches that "Brides and bridegrooms supply the site with ordering information..."(Cohen, Paragraph 4); clearly they cannot register their gifts at the service provider sites as required by element (b) of Claim 29. A gift registrant accessing goods or services online from a plurality of SP sites is therefore not taught

by Cohen. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and allow the claim.

As per Claim 30, the Examiner admits that Cohen does not disclose that the gift purchaser accesses the wish list by searching for at least one criterion, but notes that "it is well known" to do so. Applicant must assume the Examiner means, "was well known" at the time of the application. Again, there is no teaching whatsoever in Cohen that this is part of the systems described. Applicant is left to guess what makes it "obvious" to the Examiner. Yes, there is an "advantage of enabling a gift purchaser to find the wish list on a site where there are a multiplicity of wish lists," as the Examiner points out, but again, there are a multitude of ways one could navigate to a wish list, the most common being, in 1999, using a password or login. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner cite a specific reference disclosing this element and within the two references a suggestion to combine, or else allow the claim.

As per Claim 32, the Examiner quotes Cohen as disclosing "a couple's personalized 'Our Wedding Page'" and the Examiner says that this phrase "implies" the elements of Claim 32. However, Cohen does not suggest the step of, "the gift registrant registering an occasion and associating at least one wish list with the occasion, the occasion data and the association(s) being stored in an occasion data memory structure accessible to the gift registry site." There is no description of the "Our Wedding Page" beyond that guests can purchase gifts there. It could be nothing more than a personalized catalog of purchasable items with no occasion data at all. There is no teaching that occasion data, such as dates, guest lists, reminder schedules, nor any data disclosed in the Applicant's system, is stored anywhere in the systems of Cohen. Nor is there any teaching that any occasion data is accessible to the gift registry site for processing by the gift registry application (an element Cohen also lacks).

Claims 31 and 33-45 all have the same claim elements that Claim 29 has, and, as discussed above, those elements are neither taught nor suggested by any combination of cited art. Without acquiescing to the presence of claim elements specific to Claims 31 and 33-45 in any of the references, Applicant respectfully submits that the missing elements discussed above are not taught in any of the cited references and, therefore, Claims 31 and 33-45 are allowable, regardless of the applicability of further reference combinations. Therefore, since a prima facie case for obviousness has not been established, Applicant requests early favorable action on dependent Claims 31 and 33-45.

Independent claims 46 and 47 each contain the same elements from Claim 29 that have been discussed in light of Cohen: element (a) "running a gift registrar application on at least one gift registry site", and element (b) "a gift registrant accessing goods or services online from a goods or service provider (SP) Site" (element (b) in Claim 46 differs from Claim 29 only in that a single Service Provider is claimed rather than a plurality of Service Providers). Neither of these elements is disclosed or even suggested by Cohen as discussed above. While, as a courtesy the above arguments will not be repeated here, Applicant believes that since these elements are not taught by Cohen, nor Shilcrat and since no further support has been given for the Examiner's 'official notice' in the rejections of Claims 46 and 47, the claims are allowable and early favorable action is requested.

Applicant believes that it has responded fully to all of the concerns expressed by the Examiner in the Office Action, and respectfully requests that new Claims be entered and examined, and that early favorable action be taken on all claims pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reexamination of all rejected claims and early favorable action on them as well.

If the Examiner has any further concerns, Applicant requests a call to Applicant's attorney Patrick Dwyer at (206) 550-4049.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Patrick M. Dwyer". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "P" and "D".

PATRICK MICHAEL DWYER
Reg. No. 32,411

P002D1-OA1.RSP

PATRICK M. DWYER PC
1317 SIXTH AVENUE N, SUITE 404
SEATTLE, WA 98109